



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,140	08/25/2003	Richard Harvey	063170.6611	3247
5073	7590	02/12/2007		
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980			EXAMINER LEWIS, ALICIA M	
			ART UNIT 2164	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS	02/12/2007		ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 02/12/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

glenda.orrantia@hotmail.com
mike.furr@bakerbotts.com
ptomail1@bakerbotts.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/648,140

Applicant(s)

HARVEY ET AL.

Examiner

Alicia M. Lewis

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY-(30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed November 17, 2006. No claims have been amended. Claims 13-17 have been added, thus claims 1-17 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 5, 11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. It is unclear as to what is meant by the term "publisher assertion keyed reference." The term is ambiguous and is not clearly defined in the specification.

Appropriate action is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1- 6 are rejected as not producing a useful, tangible result. The language of the claims raises a question as to whether the

claims are directed merely to an abstract idea which would not result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Specifically, the claimed subject matter does not produce a useful result because the claimed subject matter fails to sufficiently reflect at least one practical utility set forth in the descriptive portion of the specification. More specifically, while the described practical utility is directed to providing a relatively extensible, efficient and reliable implementation of UDDI based on a Directory, the claimed subject matter relates ONLY to the formulation of object classes having attributes. The claimed subject matter also fails to produce a tangible result because the claimed subject matter fails to produce a result that is limited to having real world value rather than a result that may be interpreted to be abstract in nature as, for example, a thought, a computation, or manipulated data.

Claims 7-12 are directed to a computer recording medium comprising code for providing a web services directory and defining attributes of a specific type. This claimed subject matter lacks a practical application of a judicial exception (law of nature, abstract idea, naturally occurring article/phenomenon) since it fails to produce a useful, concrete and tangible result.

Specifically, the claimed subject matter does not produce a useful result because the claimed subject matter fails to sufficiently reflect at least one practical utility set forth in the descriptive portion of the specification. More specifically, while the described practical utility is directed to providing a relatively extensible, efficient and reliable

Art Unit: 2164

implementation of UDDI based on a Directory, the claimed subject matter relates ONLY to the formulation of object classes having attributes. The claimed subject matter also fails to produce a tangible result because the claimed subject matter fails to produce a result that is limited to having real world value rather than a result that may be interpreted to be abstract in nature as, for example, a thought, a computation, or manipulated data.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan et al. (US Patent 6,834,286 B2) ('Srinivasan') in view of Gadbois et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0002955 A1) ('Gadbois').

With respect to claims 1 and 7, Srinivasan teaches:

providing a directory (Figure 1, abstract, column 4 lines 34-37) having object classes and attributes (Figure 1, column 1 lines 54 – column 2 line 13); and

defining attributes of a specific type which correspond to a specific object class (Figures 1 and 4, column 2 lines 1-50, column 5 lines 37-65).

Srinivasan does not explicitly teach that the directory is used for providing web services.

Gadbois teaches information model mapping with shared directory tree representation (see abstract), in which he teaches a web services directory (paragraph 5 lines 14-25 and paragraph 24).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Srinivasan by the teaching of Gadbois because a web services directory would enable a registry service to help support the storage and retrieval of data and enable authentication, which would provide secure access to Internet services and applications (Gadbois, paragraphs 24 and 25). The modification would also enable an improved method and system for storing and maintaining object-oriented data in an RDBMS, more particularly for storing and maintaining directory information objects, such as LDAP data, in an RDBMS (Srinivasan, column 4 lines 25-31).

With respect to claims 2, 8 and 14, Srinivasan as modified teaches wherein the object classes are a subclass of an abstract object class (Srinivasan, column 14 lines 18-36).

With respect to claims 3, 9 and 15, Srinivasan as modified teaches wherein the specific object class relates to at least one of keyed references, names and classes (Srinivasan, Figure 1; Gadbois, paragraph 38, paragraph 64).

With respect to claims 4, 10 and 16, Srinivasan as modified teaches wherein the object class is an auxiliary object class (Srinivasan, column 15 lines 15-21).

With respect to claims 5, 11 and 17, Srinivasan as modified teaches wherein the auxiliary object class is a Publisher Assertion Keyed Reference (Gadbois, paragraphs 38-39, paragraph 47, paragraph 64).

With respect to claims 6 and 12, Srinivasan as modified teaches further comprising providing specific attributes which relate to one object class for a purpose of enhancing searching (Srinivasan, column 9 lines 1-11).

With respect to claim 13, Srinivasan as modified teaches:

providing a web services directory (Gadbois, paragraph 24; Srinivasan, Figure 1, abstract, column 4 lines 34-37) having a plurality of object classes, the plurality of object classes having a plurality of attributes (Srinivasan, Figure 1, column 1 lines 54 – column 2 line 13); and

defining a plurality of unique names for each of the plurality of attributes, each of the plurality of unique names corresponding to a respective one of the plurality of object classes (Srinivasan, Figures 1 and 4, column 2 lines 1-50, column 5 lines 37-65); and

generating an index based on the plurality of unique names (Srinivasan, Figures 4 and 6A-E, column 9 lines 1-21).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia M. Lewis whose telephone number is 571-272-5599. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9 - 6:30, alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on 571-272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

Application/Control Number: 10/648,140

Page 8

Art Unit: 2164

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Alicia Lewis
January 29, 2007



**SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER**